



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Response to M. Anzai

Citation for published version:

Cairns, D 2014, 'Response to M. Anzai', *Japan Studies in Classical Antiquity (JASCA)*, vol. 2, pp. 166-171.
<<http://www.hsozkult.de/journal/id/zeitschriftenausgaben-8240>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Japan Studies in Classical Antiquity (JASCA)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Symposium: "Our JASCA"
at the 2013 annual meeting of the Classical Society of Japan,
on June 1, at The University of Tokyo, Komaba

Makoto Anzai (Hokkaido University):
Our JASCA

I regret to be here and I am very sorry for my second appearance before you to speak from this higher place with a paper which might, I am afraid, sound a little patronizing, like the last one in Hiroshima, 2002. Moreover, this time in English! But what I am going to utter is, I hope, not so much a patronizing command to start a battle as a suggestion which could encourage you and me, and, as a consequence, could develop our society, the Classical Society of Japan,.

My suggestion is about the future of our international journal (though it falls short of, I am afraid, the name at the moment), JASCA. It is of course good for us to have decided to publish it. It is good for our society and probably good for classical studies worldwide. But editorial members look as if they are at a loss, as if they don't know what to do for the future of our first international journal. "We have given birth to the journal and will keep it just alive" seems to be a policy, somewhere secretly agreed. I am very sorry for saying this, to you and to my colleagues of editorial board, and of course, to myself.

My suggestion is to change this state about our JASCA. One of my suggestions is that we offer a certain number of pages open for invited articles, mainly from East-Asian classicists, like Prof. Ahn Jaewon here and make these invitations the first step towards the cooperation among the classicists of four countries encircling the East China Sea and the Sea of Japan; Korea, Taiwan, Mainland China, and Japan. If this proposal is adopted, quick and direct effects will be easy for everyone to see. The contributions to JASCA will increase. A real work of referee will be produced for the members of editorial board. The issues will increase inevitably, first to be biennial, then annual. If we will be able to have annual issues, we will really have a periodical international academic journal in classical philology.

My proposal has another, more serious purpose, which will have some connections with "well-being of the classical studies worldwide." I would like to

explain the merits of my suggestion through my own recent experiences learnt from the communications with those with me on the panel.

Within two years, 2011-12, it happened that I, on the one hand, got two invitations to attend two classical meetings in East-Asian universities and, on the other, I had two, rather self-devised meetings with Prof. Cairns here. Since I think these meetings have strong relations to ‘the other’ merit of my suggestion, I will tell them in a chronological order.

July 2011, the group “Philologica” invited Prof. Cairns to Sapporo and held a conference (in English) there, with some of you as audience, and with others as speakers. I read a paper on two different attitudes of the two poets, Hesiod and Homer (as the last poet of the *Iliad*¹), concerning Hellas-Barbaroi distinction in their respective works. Shortly after the meeting I received an invitation letter from Prof. Ahn Jaewon asking that I attend a meeting held by Greco-Roman Society of Korea, in Seoul University. I attended the meeting and read the same paper. The paper itself is published on a recent issue of the journal of the Society². Here I want to attach my own short comment to the article, which has some relevance to the following part of my speech.

A real and hidden purpose of the article is to keep a possibility open; the possibility to allow me to think that, though the knowledge of the world behind the poetic works of the two poets look different on the surface, the two poets historically may have possessed the same knowledge of the world. The last poet of the *Iliad* seems to be ignorant of the frontier to divide the world into two, Hellenic world and Barbaroi. Hesiod, on the other, evidently knew the world of Barbaroi and consequently knew the division of the world. This difference seems to imply that they belonged substantially different stages in a progress towards a national integration. But this inevitable conclusion from the facts on the surface, the different outlook of their worlds, is not compatible with the general idea about the ages of the two poets. Indeed as will be generally felt, the two poets seem to represent nearly the same stage in the ‘Ages of Heroes’, the last stage. It will certainly be odd if the two poets who are regarded to belong to the same stage in one cultural history, which is ancient Greek world, with, according to the general view, at most 100 years in their difference of their lifetimes, had had completely different knowledge of the world,

¹ I want here to think only of this poet. The reason is, I confess, that I do not have a clear vision of the last *Odyssey* poet on this account: What is his attitude to the last phase of Greek Oral Epic Poetry? And I will call the last (oral) poet of the *Iliad* simply as Homer in the following part of this paper.

² The Journal of Korean Society of Greco-Roman Studies .

one being conscious of the distinction between Hellas and Barbaroi, the other being unconscious.

Of course, if something of huge cultural and historical meaning had happened between their lifetimes, we could accept the difference. However, at least for me, their cultural positions are the same: they both stand at the end of the 'Age of Heroes', to use a historical term used by Hesiod.

Please, my audience, don't worry! My speech is surely making a progress towards its end, the return to the suggestion. Anyway, I will not enter here the details of my published discussion.

The next year, 2012, in November, I visited Edinburgh with one paper and one idea still in a form of a rough sketch to give an answer to the problem around the rejection by Achilles to three envoys in book 9 of the *Iliad*. This latter potential paper, whose purpose is to explain the reason of the rejection by Achilles, had been indeed the final goal (though unexpressed) of the paper I brought in a written form. So I had brought two papers, one printed on 18 pages of A-4 paper and the other, a sort of appendix, but not yet written, for the discussions with him. Simply put, I brought a paper, half of which had been written down, the other half not yet. I read the paper I had brought into a lecture room arranged by Prof. Cairns, but unfortunately my private reasons did not allow me to stay in Edinburgh any longer and I could not realize the true purpose of the visit, the discussion with Prof. Cairns over my interpretation for the "rejection by Achilles." I will later visit this topic.

Though my private reasons were continuing, I visited two weeks later Taiwan National University to keep my promise with Prof. Vassilis Vagios. Prof. Ahn Jaewon and Prof. Yasunari Takada too were attending the meeting arranged by Prof. Vagios. Well, I have introduced all the person on the panel.

Perhaps it was a smell of energy emitted by young classicists from various cities of Taiwan and Ahn Jaewon from Seoul that led me to make a suggestion: that we could work for building a sort of association of the classicists of four countries, Korea, Taiwan, Japan, and the Mainland China (though, since the representatives of the Mainland China were not present in the conference, their opinions are not yet reflected in what follows). Surprisingly their answer to my rather light-hearted suggestion was very quick and without any tone of hesitation. "OK! Let's go ahead," was a unanimous answer.

Let me utter a few words on the possible causes of their energy. They are after all young in their mind. Some of you who are old enough will understand what I am saying. They are young, young in their history of their intellectual activities, the

classical studies. They are working to give start and establish classical studies in their countries, working for the movement to build a lasting institution to support classical studies and education in the two universities, Seoul University and Taiwan National University. Since in the two universities professors are already teaching Greek and Latin languages and literatures within a regular faculty curriculum, they are very near to their goal, or they have partly realized their dream.

Other reason for their quick and positive answer may be a fact, or it might be called a rumor, that the Mainland China is using a huge budget, apparently with a view to follow their, Korean and Taiwanese, movements. If they, authorities in the Mainland China, really give a go-ahead signal to an official start of classical studies in that country, the map of classical studies in East Asia will change a lot. Classicists in Taiwan and from Korea were positive to my suggestion, with reason.

I would like to add a few words about the developments of classical studies in East Asia. I do not want myself to be counted among persons who will consider that they, Koreans, Taiwanese, and people in the Mainland China, are making a movement in an imitation of the history of post-war Japan. I do not want to be such a haughty and insensible man. To my view, they, Korean people, people in Taiwan, and people in the Mainland China have unmistakably learned after the building of their own new and at the same time old countries and new universities, the importance of the study of classical civilization, however remote in time and space are the two civilizations, Greek and Roman, for them, and however the outward images they have got of the classical and modern European civilization are complex.

If my suggestion will be accepted as one of principles in editing JASCA, what will begin in the journal will give an encouragement to continue and develop the study in our country as well. I believe this on the following grounds:

The first reason is the fact that I mentioned above: that they, classicists in East Asia, are young in their activity. We are old enough compared with them. Our Society was built about sixty years ago. We are surely much younger in classical studies when compared with classical scholars in Europe. But sixty years are long enough to make various symptoms of old age in our Society's face. Since, however, it will be an unpleasant task to count one's own old age and ugliness, I will not enter the detail of our old age symptoms. The good ERIS for a variety of aims in studies with these young neighbors, who, moreover, live in a similar historical context in

their westernization to ours, will surely be able to rejuvenate us. This is the first good point of my suggestion.

The second merit is a “practical” one. I will tell this in a form of a dialogue based on one held between Ahn Jaewon and me in Taipei in 2012.

We had finished the whole of the program at the meeting. We had shared the last dinner in Taipei, and just before going to bed we, Ahn Jaewon and Yasunari Takada and I, had enjoyed together a little more drink in a café near the hotel reserved for us. After arriving at our final destination of the day’s activities, just after we had stepped out of an elevator, just before saying each other, “Good night” (Ahn Jaewon and I had rooms on the same floor of the hotel), Jaewon suddenly said “Did you see ‘that’ on a television?” I knew what scene he was mentioning. Television channels in Taipei had been busy in reporting the disputes we, Koreans and Japanese, were having around the possession of an island near the border of the two country. “Yes, I saw that scene.” “Isn’t it a sad one?” “Sure it is, sad and depressing.” “I think we can offer,” said Jaewon, “another kind of communication we, Koreans and Japanese, are capable of, in Seoul next autumn.” He had offered that Seoul University would be an initiator for our meeting when I had suggested my plan of future East Asian association in classical studies.

Even I, a totally inexperienced person in political world, could understand what he was thinking, what kind of effect was in his mind. The picture of our meeting, of classicists gathered from the four countries around the East China Sea and the Sea of Japan in Seoul to discuss works by Homer, Sophocles, Plato, Cicero, Virgil and so on, will have a very different message about the relations of these four countries from those, for example, I got from the television news I watched in Taipei, if only our meeting in the next autumn or after will be realized and if the scene of our discussion will be given to public. The message will not only be a purely political one. It will be able to encourage us too, the classicists.

This possible message hinted by Prof. Ahn Jaewon is the second reason of my suggestion. It can surely have much more visible encouragement for us the members of our society, to go ahead in classical studies and towards the realization of our, East-Asian classicists, cooperation in some form or other.

But the picture of our having discussions around classical texts seems to me to indicate much more academically promising possibilities, which is my third reason for the proposal of cooperation. It seems to have much more lasting attraction, but, unfortunately, it seems to be a very difficult and complex task to explain the reason. It has also, it seems to me, something to do with the idea about the understanding of

the very important problem in the *Iliad*, which I tried to discuss with Prof. Cairns, November 2012. Though complex, I will try the task.

The problem I had wanted to discuss with Prof. Cairns in Edinburgh had been and still is, one of the most serious problems in understanding the *Iliad*. The problem is the reason of the rejection by Achilles to the offer of (enough amount of) compensation and the request for his return from the headquarters of Achaean Army. Many of you will know the importance of the interpretation.

I want to refer several points important for us to reach a reasonable explanation of the real background of the rejection and the role given by the last *Iliad* poet within the overall structure of the story, although, to tell the very truth, I have not reached to a decisive explanation yet.

First, I would like to say that this rejection is the basic structure upon which the whole building of the *Iliad* stands. It is certainly true that, as has been traditionally understood, this rejection is the most prominent case of the retardations in the Homeric Epic. But even if it is correct that the poetic technique of retardation is employed around the rejection, the rejection as a retardation, first must work to strengthen the effect of some other poetic purpose: the technic must have an end. Secondly, the retardation in the form of the rejection must have a persuasive truth. To be brief, we should say that the rejection is both the unique cause and the form of Achilles' tragedy itself and that it has the reality as the necessary response of a supreme warrior. By this rejection the hero is thrown into a serious dilemma, which is at the same time the story of Achilles itself. He, as a supreme kind of hero, must have a fight in the battlefield to show himself as a supreme hero. The place where he should appear is not a meeting place of elders. It must be a bloody battlefield. But he decided nevertheless to be obstinately away from the battlefield. This contradiction is, simply put, both the foundation stone and the building itself of an overall structure with the name of the *Iliad*, of the tragedy of Achilles. Therefore, to appreciate his tragedy in full we must really accept the reason of the rejection.

On the other hand, and secondly, it is generally recognized that his rejection is a very exceptional response as a personal decision according to a heroic code. Prof. Cairns clearly says that his rejection is only understandable as an extra-code movement, where Achilles has given a priority to his own self-interest over an ideal response in heroic society. As if to give agreement to the modern views on Achilles' rejection, the poet tells us one fact, that all the heroes who heard his rejection, Phoenix, Ajax, and Diomedes, could not understand the reason of his rejection. But at the same time these descriptions of their difficulties, which were equally felt by

those heroes in understanding the real reason, suggest a possibility that the rejection is decided on, so to speak, motives found outside the traditional heroic society itself.

Third – from this point on, the bases for the explanations will become more hypothetical – is the possibility that the two poets, Homer and Hesiod, stand basically in a homogeneous position towards the Age of Iron. This was, as I said above, a hidden purpose of my Greco-Roman Journal article, the first version of which was read July 2011 in Sapporo, and discussed with Prof. Cairns in Hokkaido University. Hesiod, as the poet himself says clearly (*Op.* 177~179), lived and created as an epic poet who was born when an epic tradition (or the form of society which had sustained the tradition³) was virtually over. There, as a poet of the final generation of epic tradition, he voices a pessimistic view over the coming age, or rather the age that is making a progress before his own eyes, the Age of Iron. That Homer was living in the same historical situation, that he also lived in an age when men could clearly see that the Age of Heroes was over, in an age when heroic epic was becoming a desperate task for an *aoidos*, can be seen, for example, though very indirectly, in the words of Sarpedon in book 12 of the *Iliad*.

There the hero gives a vivid and very self-conscious expression to social values under the pressure of which he must make some decisions which might take even his life, values being such as γέρας, τίμη, αἰδώς: they, Sarpedon and Glaucos, must go into the burning field because if they fail to do that there will be a great νέμεσις among the Lycian people against themselves. The point is that this sort of conscious words from the characters or from the poet himself never comes to the mouth in the initial stages of one literary tradition, or form of society, in its zenith either. These kinds of self-reflective or self-conscious words about the system of the society within which characters and poets are supposed to live, can be formulated only when a literary tradition and the social code that has sustained it come to court the difficulties, or if expressed in a more blatant form, when the society and literary tradition come to an end. Then, at the end of any tradition, people begin to think for the first time, “What was that, the poetic tradition that we have long enjoyed? What was that, the society where we have lived for a long time enjoying the poetic tradition?”

Fourth: the poet of the *Iliad* has put a curious scene just before the beginning of a great rejection scene. I am talking about a scene where the hero himself is singing κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Il.* 9. 189) and where the hero's *hetairos*, Patroclos, is listening alone

³ This will be the meaning of the Age of Heroes in the *Works*. It is not a historical term with a purely scientific framework.

to the hero's performance. This is indeed a very curious scene, just because of its unlikeliness: the hero is a supreme warrior and not at all an oral poet. This scene is quite different from the scenes where professional oral poets are performing short epics in the *Odyssey*. Because what the bards are doing in the *Odyssey* is not strange at all in the sense that they are simply performing their own profession. This scene of the *Iliad* is quite different also from the scene of Odysseus' telling the story of his own wandering, told in the Phaeacian palace (*Odyssey* IX~XII), because the hero, Odysseus, did not sing (ᾄδε), but he simply, in fact, *told* the story (τί πρῶτόν τοι ἔπειτα, τί δ' ὅσ' ἄτιον καταλέξω; *Od.* 9. 14). It is just because of the medium by which his wandering is told to Phaeacians and to us that his story is in a form of epic. He did not sing the long story of his wandering as an *aoidos*, that is, to the phorminx. But here in our scene in the *Iliad*, surprisingly, Achilles is singing with phorminx in his hands and sitting on a chair just as bards would have done so.

To continue an examination of remarkable points of the scene as a part of epic poetry, here Achilles is doing just what the oral poet (the last Homer) would have done before his audience, if he, the last Homer, had once really performed the *Iliad*: singing κλέα ἄνδρῶν (which is the *Iliad* itself) to the phorminx, on a chair. Here Patroclus, another hero of the epic, is doing just what the audience would have been doing, if there had been really an oral performance of our *Iliad*: listening to the oral poet who is singing κλέα ἄνδρῶν until his song comes to an end.

We must expect an accumulation of highly sophisticated poetic techniques, and I hope that Homeric students will begin arguments over the implication of the scene in terms of art. Possible effects of the scene for the meaning to be procured for the story will, of course, be various. But one effect seems to be certain and important for the answer to the reason of Achilles' rejection. The image of the singing bard overlaps to that of Achilles and *vice versa*. To put it into more familiar relations, we could say from this scene on Achilles becomes "in part" the poet before the audience. And the audience will have been given a position within a course of the events in the poem through the image of Patroclus. They "in part" become, to use somewhat naïve words, Patroclus. At the same time through this "mingling" they, the poet who is now performing and the audience who are now listening, have got a sort of right to intrude into the story, to affect the story from outside the traditional epic world. For us the reader of the *Iliad*, the images of oral performance of the poem and the singing bard, Homer, and his audience, will have ascended to the surface of our consciousness and will continue to float through the great discussion scenes of book 9 and after.

Achilles as the poet and Patroclus as the audience of the *Iliad* is not the end of my story. Achilles' κλέος here for the first time in the *Iliad* appears on the surface of the story and after its appearance occupies the central parts around the decisions by Achilles; twice in the rejection by Achilles of the command to come back to the battle field (9. 413; 9. 415), once by Phoenix in the climax of his persuasion that Achilles should give up his wrath (9.524), and finally, again by Achilles himself, at the scene of his decision to come back to the bloody battlefield to seek revenge for the death of Patroclus (18. 121). Thus, what he was singing in his tents becomes the central theme to the realization of which the *Iliad* itself struggles.

Fifth and the last point: history woven into the epic. Hesiod is said to be a precursor of Ionian historians, with reason. One could perhaps say what he is doing through two pictures in his “five Ages of men”, that of the Age of Heroes and of the Age of Iron, is not just to make a mention of two different ages, but certainly he has made these two pictures into a historical sequence by the intrusion of his own wish (μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ὄφελον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισιν μετεῖναι / ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ πρόσθεν θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι *Works* 174-175). Something vital, very important for a poet to create has changed irrevocably between two ages, what he calls the Age of Heroes and the Age of Iron. What I am curious to know is this; is this historical framework working also in the last Homer? We could not give an instant positive answer. The *Iliad* tells us actions conveyed within 50 days. Theoretically, therefore, no history can be woven into the poem. The tendency, however, to divide heroes into two types, older and younger, is discernible, and I would like to say that the distinction is fairly sharp and conspicuous in the *Iliad*. Trojan people and their allies belong to an extremely old kind. Sarpedon expresses in pure form the ideal relations desirable among τίμη-γέρας-αἰδώς-νέμεσις (typical value-complex in heroic age), and without any hesitation he leads Glaucos into a burning battle. Hector's ἀιδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας (*Il.* 6. 442) is all too famous. He chooses to be completely under a social pressure of the Heroic society. And further, please remind yourself of the Märchen-like (with some grotesque coloring, at least for me) description of the palace of Priamos as a factory to produce his grandchildren (*Il.* 6.243-50). The factory was very important for epic societies. Blood relations were a main stay for every Heroic society to support its own future. To get descendants therefore is a chief concern for those in power. If all these things with pure and primitive smells of heroic age around the people and warriors inside and around the palace of Priamos are not caused by an ethnic difference (they are not, as far as I believe) shared among the poet and his audience, between Hellenic people and Asian, these

characteristics prove the fact that Trojans and their allies were considered to belong to an older generations of Heroes, or in other words, they are all given such a role in the poem.

Achilles too, alone among Achaeans, is depicted as an extremely old kind of hero. Since, however, I fear that I have deviated for a long time, I want to be short. The best evidence that the poet has given him role as a hero of the older kind is that his “eternal fame (κλέος ἄφθιτον)” was accomplished in a form of revenge for his *hetairos*’ death, and the *philia* for his *hetairos* was indeed one of most important “cements” in the Age of Heroes and now in the danger of extinction among the people of the Age of Iron, as Hesiod says (*Op.* 182ff.)⁴.

Agamemnon and his Achaeans, consequently, move to a group of “new heroes”, or if it is possible to use words with contradiction, “heroes of the Age of Iron.” If the Age of Iron is another name for the first civilization Europeans have created, actually they, Agamemnon and the Achaeans who followed him can be said to have made the first step of the progress, by their revolution in the army, by giving Agamemnon an absolute military and political position (without having a valor as a heroic warrior, that is ἀρετή). Nestor on the other hand is an originator of the revolution: he makes a suggestion in Book 2, after Achilles has hid himself in his tents, to build an organized army (2. 362-8)⁵.

I should really stop talks about my problems in understanding the *Iliad* I have been courting for several years. What is more important here is, not my interpretation on the possible reason and the meaning of Achilles’ rejection: for the interpretation there will be more suitable form and occasion, which will be an extensive academic paper or a book with details supporting my understanding of the epic. Here at this panel I would rather focus on an “idiosyncrasy” of my understanding. What is more suitable topic for me as a chief panelist here will be, not the “idiosyncrasy” of my interpretation itself, but what I have experienced dealing with my own “idiosyncratic” understandings of the *Iliad*.

⁴ οὐδὲ πατὴρ παιδεσσιν ὁμοίος οὐδέ τι παῖδες,
οὐδὲ ξείνος ξεινοδόκῳ καὶ ἑταῖρος ἑταίρῳ,
οὐδὲ κασίγνητος φίλος ἔσεται, ὥς τὸ πάρος περ. (Hes. *Op.* 182-4)

⁵ κρίν’ ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα κατὰ φρήτρας Ἀγάμεμνον,
ὥς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγη, φύλα δὲ φύλοις.
εἰ δέ κεν ὥς ἔρξης καὶ τοι πείθωνται Ἀχαιοί,
γνώσῃ ἔπειθ’ ὅς θ’ ἠγεμόνων κακὸς ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν
ἦδ’ ὅς κ’ ἔσθλός ἔησι: κατὰ σφέας γὰρ μαχέονται.
γνώσεαι δ’ εἰ καὶ θεσπεσίη πόλιν οὐκ ἀλαπάξεις,
ἦ ἀνδρῶν κακότητι καὶ ἀφραδίῃ πολέμοιο. (Hom. *Il.* 2. 362-8)

“If my way of understanding the epic is not a consciously fabricated ‘idiosyncrasy’, what is it?” This has been a question constantly present in my mind whenever I think about the meaning of the epic for me. It may sound strange, but it is true, that I have never hinted at a possible answer to the question from talks with you, from my hours with you, my colleagues of Classical Society of Japan! Rather, it was from a very short experience with colleagues in classical studies in East Asia that I could get a hint for the answer: the “idiosyncrasy” of my reading of the epic was caused by an “idiosyncrasy” of my and my East Asian colleagues’ position concerning the civilization. To try to understand the *Iliad* is to make an effort to understand the poem built upon the struggle around the beginning of European civilization. We, East Asians, are completely different from European classicists concerning the given situation around the civilization. We live upon, in short, two contexts concerning the civilization.

To read the *Iliad* is to read a civilization, because the *Iliad* itself is a story on a change in a civilization, from a tribal society into the “Age of Iron”. Therefore, the reader’s condition or attitude for the civilization plays a decisive role in his understanding of the epic. Of our, East Asians’, position, I do not have time enough to tell in detail. In a word, we are still under two civilizations, both under East Asian and European. My understanding of the *Iliad* must with reason be radically different from those standard readings, which were and are current in Europe. This is what I understood around my own problems of my “idiosyncratic” reading through the short experience with my colleagues in East Asia. Just to get a hint towards the explanation of my deviation from the standard reading, I needed classical colleagues whose position in the Westernization is “similar to mine but a little different from mine”. Generally speaking, our, East Asians’, unique position in the Westernization in understanding European Classics will give us a unique and important role: a necessary supplement in understanding the European Classics because there are many important points that one (if he is a European) can’t see correctly in his ancestors’ achievements just because one has decided to consider them as one’s own ancestors.

I am far from being sure if my ‘idiosyncratic’ reading of the *Iliad* is a good example to illuminate complex conditions into which we will inevitably be thrown when we modern try to understand the first epic in the Occident, the *Iliad*. Of one thing I am now certain from my long experience, that, everyone needs to know about his own position in terms of civilization to understand a civilization “classic” properly, and for us, classicists in Japan, these knowledge about our own positions

are easier to come to grips with when we discuss about these classical works with East Asians, who are, in terms of civilization, similar to us, but decidedly different from us.

**Yasunari Takada (The University of Tokyo):
The Japanese Modern Project Faces Globalization**

A concerted agreement is in the air that there has been a palpable decline and fall in the fields of humanities. The decline and fall is not limited to this small island but is worldwide and global. The classics, or classical studies, once part and parcel of the humanities, or *letterae humaniores*, has no chance whatsoever of being exempt from this universal decline of the humanities, which inevitably carries with it the fate of the Western classics. The Japanese case of the Western classics is, of course, no exception. Although it *can* be an exception because throughout its modern history Japan has never seen the studies of Western classics so flourishing and thriving as to be later deplored in their decline. From its very beginning, the Western classics in Japan styled itself for “a select few” and assumed a distinctly anti-populist stance. It could afford to pay little regard to social accountability and validity. The proof of this case is in the fact that the department of Western classics does not exist but in a small number of national institutions and in an even smaller number of private institutions. Compared with other neighboring disciplines in the humanities, the Western classics in Japan has thus found itself rather immune to the prevalent global trend of the decline of the humanities. It has been enjoying, so to say, the security of imperishable decline.

Needless to say, however, the Western classics in Japan will *not* be able to enjoy this security of imperishable decline for good. Actually, the time has at long last come that it is in need of immediate reform and innovation. The reason is simple and obvious: the milieu in which the university system situates itself has drastically changed. In a broad perspective, we can say that we are getting back to the situation of medieval Europe, in which students and teachers were moving borderless, irrespective of what were to become national confines. What enabled the students and teachers to enjoy such academic mobility was, of course, the scholarly currency of the Latin language, the lingua franca of the intellectuals. A similar situation is now being born, as you can see, worldwide in the phenomenon called globalization. In an expanding global market of academia, distinguished professors are getting

better positions with better salaries while smart students are being offered better scholarships in better institutions. Such academic transactions are daily witnessed in the market economy of universities worldwide. And, of course, its lingua franca is English. Just as Latin became a lingua franca in the course of medieval European history, where the Catholic Church had played a major role in shaping the cultural and intellectual traditions, so too English has now become a lingua franca in the course of recent history, where after the fall of the British Empire, the United States has come to take initiative in fashioning a new model for global transactions, intellectual or otherwise.

Of course, this kind of recognition about the state of academic affairs worldwide has already become a common knowledge, and one might well be offended by being reminded yet again of what everyone is well aware of. We know that there is an increasing mobility among university teachers and students on a global scale and that English has become a common linguistic currency. But for the Japanese academics engaged in the humanities, particularly the Western classics, the recognition does not seem to be sufficiently taken seriously. Now is the age in which the curriculum concomitant with its teaching staff and supporting programs has become a commodity with which to attract students, if possible the better and best students, from all over the world. There is cutthroat competition among the universities worldwide for bright students because securing them will contribute in the long run to a betterment of their international ranking and managerial stability. But Japan, as we all know, is lagging far behind in this global competition not only in the fields of higher education but also in other important sectors. There is a palpable and persistent discrepancy between what's going on in the domestic academic market and what's going on in its global counterpart. And apparently, each market has its own distinct aims, logic and culture.

To gain a clearer picture of the present state of affairs, let me quote, however abrupt it may appear, from what Kato Hiroyuki (1836-1916), one-time president of the University of Tokyo had to say about the use of English in the educational programs back in 1890, actually four years after the establishment of the institution.

At the University of Tokyo, although its education is now being generally conducted in English, the current situation is far from what was originally intended. ... The University's aim is to have its education done all in Japanese in the near future when full-fledged provision of [Japanese] staff and library will eventually have been accomplished and materialized.⁶

⁶ Amano Ikuo, *The Birth of Universities* (Chuokoronsha, 2009), vol 1. p. 50.

At the beginning of the Japanese hasty modern project, it was the university that was expected to undertake the leading role in it and, in doing so, it found it inevitable to adopt the method of importing nearly everything from the West. (In the beginning was the word, which was English.) Kato made the above-quoted statement in reply to the criticism that the University of Tokyo was not a truly national institution but still remained a parasitic organ of Western learning wrapped up in a Western language. As if to respond to such criticism, the next year (1891) saw the first visible step toward Japanization or nationalization: it was stipulated as a principle that professorship be assumed only by Japanese staff and what used to be called “foreign professors” be assigned a new status of “foreign teachers.” This system of “foreign teachers” is worthy of particular attention and mention not only because of its symbolic function as one of the typical characteristics of the Japanese modern project, but also because of its tremendous longevity. After surviving the defeat in the WWII and subsequent Americanization, this Japanese system came at long last to be officially abolished as recently as the beginning of the twenty-first century. The fact would alert us Japanese how devastatingly durable the academic institution is in this country. This implies that the successful consolidation of the Japanese modern project dies hard in its structure and components.

When the University of Tokyo established itself as the Imperial University in 1896, the principle of Japanese language as a norm was firmly settled and beyond dispute. This principle, as a decisive factor of modernization and nationalization, was to determine the nature and structure of activities in the universities, especially in the sector of the humanities. Even the discipline of English literature was soon to contract the habit of doing the essentials in Japanese. The business of translation has thus come to the fore and with it has begun the ambitious enterprise of the selective importation of European civilization with particular emphasis on its three imperial powers, Britain, Germany and France. One of the noblest aspects of this grand enterprise is the fact that the Western classics were never entirely dismissed as of little use for modernization but were given a minimum, if not due, consideration and recognition. In its happy corollary, we are here today in an annual assembly of the Classical Society of Japan, discussing in the present symposium the matter of propriety and legitimacy about the use of English in its official journal.

The answer to that problematic question, I think, depends on the outlook one would choose to take toward the Japanese modern project against the current background of globalization. As we have seen, the Japanese universities, as the standard-bearer of its modern project, from the very beginning made it one of its

fundamental principles to perform all academic business in Japanese. Its motto held it that everything was for the sake of national independence and the enrichment of national culture. Every nation, when determined to modernize itself, will adopt the slogan, “Use National Products,” at some phase or another of its modernization. In the specific case of Japanese academic institutions, for instance, use Japan-made textbooks, Japan-made teachers and researchers, and Japan-made curriculum. As an extension of this line of argument comes the establishment of an academic society that is entirely made-in-Japan. There is thus no question about the language of its journal, the distinguished *Seikyo-kotengaku-kennkyu* (『西洋古典学研究』).

But we are now beginning to question the propriety of the exclusive use of Japanese as the journal’s official language, facing the apparently inescapable pressures and impacts of globalization. To make a long story short, the ultimate question, I think, boils down to this: how should we deal with the problem of creative coordination between the on-going tradition of our modern project and the in-coming inevitable forces of globalization.

My answer is a twofold proposal:

1. Since the Japanese modern project retains its validity in its open-minded urge to understand and import the fundamentals of European civilization, scholarship of the classics that has been conducted in this spirit has a good reason to be further pursued. Especially important is the agenda of translation. In this respect our modern project is, to borrow the famous dictum of Jürgen Habermas, still an “unfinished project.”
2. At the same time, we must be more sensitive to the resultant effects of globalization, of which a most conspicuous instance is the phenomenon of high academic mobility. The Western classics, as we have them, are no longer for the sake of national interests and culture. In their form and content, they must be open to the interests and concerns of all international students. However arduous it may be, it is necessary to create a unique and attractive program or curriculum that would be only made possible with us. In this regard, one could hardly emphasize more the fact that in our history of modernity as well as pre-modernity we have had a rare experience of going through two of the most influential classics of the world. Last not but the least, for such a global move everything is ineluctably expected to be conducted in English. Our *JASCA* is to be duly placed in the observance of the rule.

Douglas Cairns (The University of Edinburgh):
Response to Professor Makoto Anzai

It was a pleasure to be present to hear Professor Anzai's original address in Tokyo in May and it is an equal pleasure to be able to develop my thoughts on it in writing in JASCA. I shall structure my response as Professor Anzai has structured his contribution, beginning with his remarks on the future of JASCA and Japanese classics, before turning to our ongoing debate on the behaviour of Achilles in *Iliad* 9.

Japanese classics has already made its mark on the world. Its impact can only be enhanced by the existence of an English-language journal such as JASCA, and will be enhanced further if suggestions for a move to annual (and, I would add, online) publication are taken forward. I heartily endorse Professor Anzai's suggestion that Japanese classics in general and JASCA in particular should face outwards to the other East Asian nations (and beyond). Recent years have seen a substantial expansion of classical studies in China and Korea and much greater interaction between the growing number of classicists and ancient historians in those countries and their counterparts in the West. I recently attended the tenth in the triennial series of Japan-Korea-China Symposia on Ancient European History (18-21 October 2013) at Capital Normal University, Beijing, and was greatly impressed by the commitment, enthusiasm, and professionalism of (especially) the younger generation of scholars who took part. This internationalization of the subject is good for all of us: this is the future of classics and ancient history not only in East Asia, but in general. Particularly inspiring is the sense one gets especially from the new generation of enthusiastic and outward-looking Chinese scholars of their conviction that, if they want to understand Western civilization, they must understand its roots in the Graeco-Roman worlds. I only wish that Western scholarship felt the same with regard to Chinese and other East Asian civilizations. We in the West often seem to be in danger of losing sight of the need to understand our own past, much less that of other nations and cultures.

I have always considered that there would be little point in being a classicist if one did not thereby learn something about oneself, one's own society, and one's place in the world. What one learns, it need hardly be said, can derive as much from contrast as from comparison. This is where, I think, the potential for the development of East Asian classics lies – in active engagement between East and West, in treating the study of the classical civilizations as an aspect of that engagement, and in bringing East Asian understandings of East Asian civilizations

and their pasts to bear on the study of the ancient Mediterranean world and the ways in which it has been understood in a (hitherto) largely Western tradition of interpretation. Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Taiwanese perspectives on the ancient world would find a ready audience in the West if they were to continue to develop an explicitly comparative perspective, tracing the commonalities and discontinuities between East Asian literature, history, and thought and those of the Greeks and Romans.⁷ Similarly, Japanese classicists might follow the example of (some of) their western counterparts in developing a more active engagement with other humanities disciplines in their own country. Paradoxically, perhaps, this might turn out to be a way of furthering and deepening the substantial academic and research links that already exist between Japanese and Western classicists.

Professor Anzai offers his 'idiosyncratic' account of Achilles' behaviour in *Iliad* 9 as a specifically 'East Asian' or 'Japanese' reading of Homeric epic and the heroic past that it depicts. But it is also a stage in a dialogue that he and I have been engaged in for several years now; and as such it can exemplify the possibilities that arise when both sides, Eastern and Western, confront their own and each other's traditions in debating and interpreting the ancient Greek sources that fascinate us all. Naturally, we each bring a certain amount of cultural baggage to bear when interpreting these texts; no doubt we are never able to reflect consciously upon our own background assumptions to the extent of making them completely explicit. To some extent, our disagreements will always reflect cultural conditioning, ideological biases, and personal style. Nonetheless, the project of interpreting a literary work like the *Iliad* is, in a fundamental sense, an empirical one, based on a method of evaluating the primary evidence in the light of our hypotheses that is by no means confined to the sciences to the exclusion of the humanities. The best interpretations are those that account for the evidence economically and without special pleading; these can stand, for a while, until different ways of understanding the evidence come along.

Professor Anzai defines his position by antithesis with what he takes to be my own, that Achilles' rejection of the Embassy in *Iliad* 9 is a self-interested, non-normative response that is in some way external to what some call the 'heroic code'. But this is not quite what I think. I agree with those, notably Christopher Gill,⁸ who argue that Achilles' withdrawal from the fighting and his insistence on his grievance in *Iliad* 9 represent moves from within the complex of Homeric values that

⁷ As, of course, many already do, as (to take just one example) in the case of Dr Yamagata's essay on Homer and the *Tale of the Heike* in *JASCA* 1 (2011).

⁸ C. Gill, *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy* (Oxford, 1996), 124-74.

constitute a kind of second-order reflexion on the nature of those values. Achilles' complaint in Book 1, a complaint that he reiterates and sustains in Book 9, is a matter of principle and not just pride. Acting arbitrarily and unilaterally, Agamemnon violates communal protocols for the allocation of marks of esteem, undoes an established distribution, fails to respect Achilles' entitlement to a prize duly awarded in recognition of his efforts and his status, and belittles the real contribution that Achilles' prowess makes to the success of the Achaeans' mission. Where Achilles' response becomes problematic is in his insistence (in Book 9) on focusing only on the dispute between himself and Agamemnon to the exclusion of the claims of his *philoî*. In Book 1, though he initially intervened in the interests of the army as whole (1. 54, 386), he came to see his comrades' failure to take his side as an endorsement of Agamemnon's actions (1. 231-2, 299). But in Book 9, all his vitriol is reserved for Agamemnon: whereas in Book 1 he represented the distribution of prizes as a communal process carried out by 'the sons of the Achaeans' (1. 162, 392; cf. Nestor at 1. 276), by Book 9 it has become a procedure that is determined by Agamemnon, in his own interests, from start to finish (9. 328-36). Each of the ambassadors makes two essential points: (1) Agamemnon has offered adequate compensation to make amends for his offence (9. 260-1, 299; 515-23; 632-9); and (2) Achilles' obligations to his comrades (of honour, friendship, and pity) give him reasons to return to the conflict that are independent of his grievances towards Agamemnon (9. 228-59, 300-3; 496-7, 518, 520-2; 630-1, 639-42). It now seems to me that the fundamental reason for Achilles' refusal to return to the fighting is a simple one: his experience with Agamemnon in Book 1 has undermined his trust, chiefly in Agamemnon, but also to some extent in general. We see this in the opening words of his response to the appeal of Odysseus, the first of the three ambassadors to speak (9. 308-13):

“διογενὲς Λαερτιάδῃ πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ
 χρηὲν μὲν δὴ τὸν μῦθον ἀπηλεγέως ἀποπειπεῖν,
 ἣ περ δὴ φρονέω τε καὶ ὥς τετελεσμένον ἔσται, 310
 ὥς μὴ μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος.
 ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Αἴδαο πύλῃσιν
 ὅς χ’ ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ.”

These lines express a personal commitment to plain speaking, but they also have their implications for Odysseus (who has sensibly omitted the closing lines – and

only the closing lines – of the speech in which Agamemnon made his offer of reparation, 9. 158-61) as well as for Agamemnon himself, whose remarks on the need for Achilles to accept his superiority – the very words omitted by Odysseus – indicate that, whatever else it does, his offer betrays the same desire to dominate as he manifested in Book 1. The audience knows that Agamemnon’s offer, as relayed by Odysseus, says one thing, but means another; it conveys a hierarchical message that Odysseus has suppressed but is there to be discerned in its sheer scale, as well as in some of its terms. When Achilles bitterly dismisses the suggestion of marriage to one of Agamemnon’s daughters – “ὁ δ’ Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλον ἐλέσθω, | ὅς τις οἱ τ’ ἐπέουκε καὶ ὃς βασιλεύτερός ἐστιν”, 9. 391-2 – he not only reveals that he has inferred Agamemnon’s preoccupation with rank and hierarchy from the terms in which his offer was made, but actually repeats the very word which (the audience knows) expressed Agamemnon’s insistence on his superior status at 9. 160 (“καί μοι ὑποστήτω ὅσον βασιλεύτερός εἰμι ...”). Beyond all this, however, Achilles’ words at 9. 308-13 express his suspicion of the whole enterprise. This suspicion, the lack of trust, is the point of his repeated assertions that Agamemnon has *deceived* him, and so he is determined not to trust Agamemnon, and thus lay himself open to further deception, from now on (9. 344-5, 370-1, 375-6).

The ambassadors’ increasing emphasis on the obligations that a man of honour owes his friends makes an impression on Achilles; that this is the decisive factor in the concessions he makes in moving from his initial determination to return home (9. 357-63), *via* his announcement that he will decide ‘tomorrow’ whether to go or to stay (9. 618-19), to his decision to remain aloof from the fighting until it reaches *his own* ships (9. 650-5) is clear from his response to Ajax’s brief but powerful intervention (9. 624-42, with the reply at 644-55), but may be inferred in the case of Phoenix’s speech too. The reason why these considerations do not persuade him to relent completely is straightforward – whatever their force, he is still furious about the original offence (9. 645-8):

πάντά τί μοι κατὰ θυμὸν εἰσαο μὴθῆσασθαι·	645
ἀλλὰ μοι οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλῳ ὅππότε κείνων	
μνήσομαι ὥς μ’ ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν	
Ἀτρεΐδης ὥς εἴ τιν’ ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.	

That response was warranted: Agamemnon admits that he started the quarrel as early

as Book 2 (378),⁹ and his response to Nestor in the council of Book 9 makes it clear that he accepts both the blame and the need to make amends (9. 115-20). Odysseus admits that he can see why Achilles might now hate Agamemnon (9. 300-1), and Phoenix observes that if Agamemnon were not now offering reparation, Achilles' anger would still be justified (9. 515-23). But now that he is, it is not – Phoenix's phrase, πρὶν δ' οὐ τι νεμεσσητὸν κεχολῶσθαι (523), puts the emphasis on the πρὶν, and implies that persistence in anger will make Achilles liable to censure.

Censure, however, is the least of Achilles' worries. Both Odysseus and Phoenix have warned him that he may live to regret it if he rejects their appeals (9. 249-50; 502-12, 604-5). This is the point of Phoenix's allegory of the Litai, which presents both Agamemnon's offence and rejection of his attempt to make amends for that offence as cases of ἄτη. The audience already has a good idea of what it is that Achilles will have cause to regret: the Embassy in Book 9 is preceded by Zeus' prophecy, in Book 8, that Achilles will not return to battle until Patroclus is dead (8. 470-7). Achilles, in Book 18, will express his regret that he was no help to Patroclus *or to his other comrades* (18. 102-3).

Achilles thus has good reasons, in terms of Homeric ethical norms, for his anger towards Agamemnon and for the strategy that he pursues in order to punish him for his offence. He also has reasons, in the manner and the spirit in which Agamemnon has chosen to pursue the option of making amends, to be suspicious of Agamemnon's motives. But the ambassadors give him additional and substantial reasons for returning to battle, reasons that are rooted in broader aspects of Homeric ethics. The notion of honour to which they appeal is not, as is still sometimes said, a simple and unambiguous one, but an inclusive complex of values that encompasses respect as well as self-respect. Achilles focuses only on the honour that he feels he has lost through Agamemnon's insult and that he feels will be vindicated *via* Zeus' support for his retaliation (9. 607-10). But the ambassadors, and Ajax in particular, remind him of the honour that he owes his friends, the corollary of the honour in which they hold him. It is less that we blame Achilles, in ethical terms, for rejecting the Embassy (though, in the immediate context, both Ajax and Diomedes do – 9. 628-40, 699-70) than that we see, in the partiality of his response and in his inability fully to yield to considerations whose persuasiveness and attraction he clearly recognizes, the error, the tragic error, of which he is warned.¹⁰

⁹ NB how 'starting it' is presented as a form of injustice by Odysseus at 19. 181-3.

¹⁰ I have defended aspects of the above interpretation in detail in various places. See (e.g.) W. Allan and D. L. Cairns, 'Conflict and Community in the *Iliad*', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds), *Competition in the Ancient World* (Swansea, 2011), 113-46; D. L. Cairns, 'Ransom and Revenge in

Yet, as Professor Anzai well shows, for someone as preoccupied with the κλέα ἄνδρῶν as Achilles is, the rejection, error though it is, is entirely characteristic. In the way that he turns, in his present situation, to the heroic past, Achilles (as Professor Anzai again shows) stands in the same relation to that past as do the performer and audience of the κλέα ἄνδρῶν that constitute the *Iliad* itself. Homeric poetry represents itself as having, through the Muses, immediate access to the truth of a past which would otherwise be merely a matter of κλέος (2. 484-6). Phoenix, too, reaches into the past as a guide to the present when he turns to the κλέα ἄνδρῶν in the form of his exemplary tale of Meleager (9. 524-5). As Homeric poetics aims, as far as possible, to collapse the distance between second-hand report and eye-witness knowledge, so Homeric rhetoric and ethics repeatedly turn to the past as a source of perspectives on the present and guides for the future. The poem as a whole culminates in Achilles' own use of the exemplary mode in presenting Niobe, his own father, Peleus, and his interlocutor, Priam, as *exempla* of the inevitability of suffering and the need to endure (24. 517-51). Thereby, he gets the κῦδος that Zeus promises at 24. 110. Achilles' use of the exemplary mode is itself exemplary for us; the values that he exemplifies – rooted as they are in the ethics of honour and reciprocity, and in a more general notion of the alternating rhythm of good and bad fortune, success and suffering – are not only those of a past heroic age; Greeks of all periods returned to them again and again; and they still have their resonance for us.¹¹

The poetry of Homer is, as Andrew Ford has termed it, the poetry of the past.¹² In both its poetics and its ethics, however, it brings its past, its present, and its projected afterlife into dialogue. Dialogue between our own civilizations, their pasts, and the classical past is the core of our enterprise as classicists and historians. It is a great source of satisfaction to be able to pursue this dialogue, in the lingua franca of contemporary scholarship, in a Japanese journal and in debate with Japanese scholars who care as much about the future of our shared discipline as I do. I very much hope that this debate will continue and develop, as JASCA fulfills Professor Anzai's hopes of providing a distinctive East Asian voice on issues of interest and

the *Iliad*', in S. Lambert (ed.), *Sociable Man: Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of N. R. E. Fisher* (Swansea, 2011), 87-116; and 'Atē in the Homeric Poems', *PLLS* 15 (2012), 1-52.

¹¹ As George Steiner writes (*Antigones* (Oxford, 1996), 242), 'The more one experiences ancient Greek literature and civilization, the more insistent the suggestion that Hellas is rooted in the twenty-fourth Book of the *Iliad*.' I explore this theme in more detail in a paper entitled 'Exemplarity and Narrative in the Greek Tradition', in D. L. Cairns and R. Scodel (eds), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh, 2014), 103-36.

¹² *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, 1992).

concern to classical scholars worldwide.

**Jaewon Ahn (Seoul National University):
JASCA! For What?**

Concerning Prof. Anzai's suggestion, I would add some reasons why we need an international journal like JASCA for classical scholarship in Asia.

There is a simple reason. We may call it an argument of *imitatio et aemulatio*. In terms of the argument of *imitatio*, it should be mentioned that Classical scholarship reception histories in Asian nations are quite different from each other. It means that there are a lot of things to be exchanged to each other in the perspective of reception because peoples in Asia have "a similar context of civilization," as Prof. Anzai said. For example, I myself as a young Korean researcher may be able to learn a lot from the Japanese reception history of the Classical scholarship, in two ways: what to follow and what to avoid. As for what to follow, I should point out e.g. the way or method of interpretations and translations of the *termini technici* of ancient Greek philosophy and certain ways of how to promote the interest of Classical texts not only among the general public but among experts group in academic societies. As for what to avoid, we may find some reasons in previous events which brought about some crisis of Classical scholarship in Japan. In this regard, I would like to point out that we have no medium in Asia through which we can share our respective experiences.

As for the argument of *aemulatio*, which Anzai called it as a good ERIS, I would like to mention that it is time for good ERIS not only for the Classical societies in Asia but also worldwide. We live in the global era, which, I believe, requires some new perspective in approaching the Classical scholarship. Undoubtedly, Classical scholarship is still regarded as an essential principle for Western civilization. However, I would ask a question whether we as classical scholars of Western civilization are open and ready to listen and reflect ideas and perspectives of Eastern civilization, e.g. of *Confucianism*, comparing the fact that many scholars of *Confucianism* are now open and even ready to accept the ideas and perspectives of Classical scholarship of Western civilization in their studies. I should confess that I myself am not ready to accept the viewpoints of Confucius in my studies on classical texts of Western civilization, just like many Classists of Eastern classics do in current days. I am often curious about whether the Classical scholarship is a

suitable principle for the Eastern civilization. Thus, I think, it is a time to ask whether the Classical scholarship is to be a universal study in the perspective of civilization. For clarifying this issue, one needs to study three research themes at least. I think, an Asian scholar can handle these better than a European scholar.

The first of them is a comparative study in the perspective of civilization. I think, (Prof.) Anzai's argument is based on this perspective. I agree with Prof. Anzai in his distinction between new hero and old hero in the *Iliad*. We may find another example of this in the comparison of Homeric idea of *kleos* and *timê* with *Si-King*(詩經)'s 譽 and 功, or that of Homeric warrior with Japanese *Samurai*, etc.

The second is a study on the history of the encounter between East and West. According to my own research, there are many things that need to be explained. It is sufficient to provide one example for this. *Shan Hai Ching* (山海經) is a well-known classical text of the mountains and seas and a compilation of early geography and myth. Some narratives in the text might have already existed in the 4th century BC. The text had reached its final form in the early Han Dynasty. In this regard, it is possible to make a comparison between some interesting narratives on strange races in *Shan Hai Ching* and those similar narratives on mythical peoples of central Asia in *Natural History* (=NH) of Pliny. To make a long story short, according to my readings, these races described in both texts could be assumed to be the same people or at least in some way interrelated to one another. The following pictures will show that clearly.



一目國



(*Shan Hai Ching* (山海經), Seoul 2006, p 208) (*Liber Chronicarum*, Nurnberg 1493, p. Blatt 12)

The picture (on the) left is “the one eyed man (一目國)” in *Shan Hai Ching*. The right is named, according to Pliny, *Arimaspus* (NH, 7. 10). It is remarkable that even

stories about these one-eyed men are very similar in both texts. On this issue, I believe that we may find many stories which are to be systematically similar to each other in both texts like that of *Arimaspus*: e.g., according to Pliny, *Anthrophagus* (NH, 7.11), *Opiogenes* (NH 7.13), *Monoculus* (NH. 7.23), *Trisphithami Pygmaei* (NH, 7.26), etc. Although due to the limit of the space, I'll not list them all here, it is noteworthy that these strange people observed in *Shan Hai Ching* are also described in a very similar way to that of Pliny's narrative. It deserves more academic attention to uncover these similarities. Could it be a mere coincidence?

The last is a study of the reception history of classical scholarship in Asia. I think, the reception history in Asia is distinguished from that of Europe, because there are many curious phenomena, which are observed in the horizon of civilization-encounter. They may be called tensions, conflicts, accommodations and acculturations in the perspective of civilization. There is no simple reception story but a complex one. I can give an example for this. It is the first article of first chapter of the Korean constitution:

1.1.1. The Republic of Korea shall be a democratic republic.

How can one understand “democratic republic” without the basic understanding of Greek idea of *democratia* and Roman concept of *res publica*? For instance, the concept of *res publica* is translated into the Chinese word 共和. However, the basic idea of the 共和 has its own history. It is found in *Sa-Ki* (史記) of Sa Ma Cheon(司馬遷). According to him, its original meaning is a period when a king is alive but in exile(帝王不在). Thus, the idea of *res publica* and the concept of 共和 are identical with each other. Anyway, we Korean use the word 共和 in the sense of *res publica*. Undoubtedly, the idea of 共和 is now regarded as a principle for Korean politics not only theoretically but also practically. Based on this brief comparison, I can argue that there is already some fundamental change in the nature of Korean society during modernization by way of the westernization which originated in Greek and Rome. I believe that this is not a question of theoretical discussion but our reality and history. On the related issue of JASCA, I have to remind you that we have no common forum for discussing those problems mentioned above. Finally, I would like to add another reason which Prof. Anzai called “practical reason”. Frankly, I would like to ask whether we Asians or at least Far East Asians have any common values or virtues which we can share each other? Of course, there are some important values of *Confucianism* and *Buddhism*. As said in the above, however, at least for example

the principle and system of Korean society has been dramatically changed. In other words, there are a lot of social problems and individual phenomena which cannot be explained and solved through the so-called the traditional standards in the perspective of civilization. It means that Asia has been through fundament(al) changes. Due to this, it urgently requires a medium like JASCA which will provide basic sources for building new standards to Asian peoples and Eastern civilization. It definitely needs a common ground for building a new civilization in this global age, based not on the ugly and sad history but on the universal human values and common sense. I think, the Classical Scholarship is a well-qualified candidate for this. According to R. Pfeiffer, the renaissance of classical scholarship is turning around! Renaissance sprung up and developed in Italy between the 14- 15th centuries. It spread to the Netherlands in 16th century and then was invited into France by royal family in the 17th century. It flourished at last in Germany and England between 18- 19th centuries. In the end, it is now globalized thanks to digital techniques by American. Who knows? The renaissance may be now in Asia preparing a new *metamorphosis* in the perspective of civilization by way of meeting and competing with Eastern Classical Scholarship, if it does move around indeed?